DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 407 95 TM 006 370

AUTHOR Natriello, Gary; And Others
TITLE A Summary of the Recent Literature on the Evaluation of Principals, Teachers, and Students. Occasional Paper No. 18.
INSTITUTION Stanford Univ., Calif. Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO SCRDT-OP-18
PUB DATE Apr 77
CONTRACT NE-C-00-3-0062
NOTE 69p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Bibliographies; Educational Policy; Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation; *Literature Reviews; Political Issues; Principals; Program Development; *Schools; *Student Evaluation; Superintendents; *Teacher Evaluation; Theories

ABSTRACT

Literature published between 1965 and 1975 on the evaluation of persons and their performance in schools is summarized in this review of the literature. Interrelationships among the evaluations of participants at several levels of the organization--the interlevel aspects of performance evaluation in schools are also examined. Each of the four sections of the review: Evaluation in Schools, Evaluation of Administrators, Evaluation of Teachers, and Evaluation of Students, are further subdivided into three categories of publications: those dealing with theoretical issues, those on policy and political issues, and those oriented toward implementation of practical issues. A 300-entry bibliography is included. (Author/EVH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED141407

Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching
School of Education, Stanford University
Stanford, California

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Occasional Paper No. 18

A SUMMARY OF THE RECENT LITERATURE ON THE EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS, AND STUDENTS

Gary Natriello, Margie Hoag, Terrence E. Deal,
and Sanford M. Dornbusch

April 1977

Published by the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, supported in part as a research and development center by funds from the National Institute of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the National Institute of Education. (Contract No. NE-C-00-3-0062.)

TM 006 370

Introductory Statement

The mission of the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching is to improve teaching in American schools. Current major operations include three research and development programs--Teaching Effectiveness, The Environment for Teaching, and Teaching and Linguistic Pluralism--and two programs combining research and technical assistance, the Stanford Urban/Rural Leadership Training Institute and the Hoover/Stanford Teacher Corps Project. A program of exploratory and related studies provides for smaller studies not part of the major programs.

The Environment for Teaching Program has conducted a series of empirical studies of educational evaluation processes using a general theoretical framework. The National Institute of Education asked us to prepare a survey of recent literature in this field so that practitioners and researchers can begin to find their way through the large volume of publications. This survey is not complete, but it may provide a reasonable point of entry for determining current knowledge of the evaluation of administrators, teachers, and students.

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. EVALUATION IN SCHOOLS 4

Theory 4

Policy . . . . .

Practice 6

3. EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS 9

Theory 9

Policy 11

Practice 14

4. EVALUATION OF TEACHERS 18

Theory 18

Policy 25

Practice 29

5. EVALUATION OF STUDENTS 35

Theory 35

Policy 38

Practice 39

BIBLIOGRAPHY 41

Abstract

This review and 300-entry bibliography cover some of the literature on the evaluation of schools, school administrators, teachers, and students published between 1965 and 1975. The authors review the works cited under the headings theory, policy, and practice.

1. INTRODUCTION

Evaluation in schools has become a critical issue. Beleaguered teachers and administrators reminisce periodically about the halcyon days when it was assumed that teachers taught and students learned, that completing high school was essential to occupational success and personal development, and that college training produced talented teachers who were prepared for the unexpected. But these assumptions are no longer widely believed, and the public is asking hard questions about the effects of schools and teaching. They want some assurance and some evidence that the teachers who teach their children are competent professionals.

Public insistence on evaluating persons and programs has caught most educational organizations napping. Evaluation of educators has never been a key concern. In part this laxity was encouraged by the assumptions noted above. But, for whatever reasons, educational evaluation processes have never been highly developed. Effective systems of evaluation do not exist in schools today. Teachers do not know what criteria are used in evaluating them; they are observed infrequently; and they are not given clear directions for improving classroom teaching. Administrators too have seldom been evaluated, either on their own performance or that of the school or district. Superintendents, because of their direct accountability to the school board, probably receive more evaluations than almost any other participant in educational organizations, with the exception of students, but the criteria on which they are evaluated often have little relationship to the quality of their work or of the district program.

The gap between interest in evaluation and the inadequacy of existing systems of evaluation has created a flurry of activity in this field. Much effort has been expended on devising new evaluation systems and writing about them. Consequently, the literature on evaluation in schools has grown at a staggering rate.

Generally, the literature has been aimed at two goals. The first is directed at evaluating results, often called "outcomes."

How well has a particular school, program, teacher, or pupil accomplished desired learning objectives? The second is aimed at evaluating performance: How well does a particular teacher or administrator conform to some desired conception of role performance?

The literature also discusses two purposes of evaluation. The first is to establish grounds for making personnel decisions--who gets hired, fired, promoted, transferred, or rewarded. The second is to help people improve their performance and grow professionally.

Finally, the evaluation literature discusses the evaluators: Who is involved in the evaluation process in schools? Is evaluation the province solely of administrators? Should evaluations emphasize exchanges among peers? Should students take a major role in evaluating? How, or even should, parents be involved?

The purpose of this paper is to summarize the recent literature on evaluation of persons and their performances in schools. We found it necessary to narrow our focus, and rather than try to cover both program and person evaluation, we have reported only work on evaluation of persons: administrators, teachers, and students. We have also examined the interrelationships of the evaluations of participants at several levels of the organization--the interlevel aspects of performance evaluation in schools. As we read, discussed, and made decisions about individual articles, we found it impossible to always make clear distinctions between the evaluation of persons and programs, performances and outcomes. Consequently, some literature covering programs and outcomes has been included, but our main emphasis has been included, but our main emphasis has been on the evaluation of persons and performances.

We have attempted here to organize, summarize, and synthesize the literature of this presently confusing and underdeveloped field. Most of the literature on evaluation in schools is not based on empirical research. Most of it is parochial at best. We expect that our efforts will be helpful to researchers working in this area. More important, we hope this summary will be useful to practitioners struggling to design evaluation systems to meet public demands and also to help improve their job-performance ability.

For the past ten years, the Environment for Teaching Program has been studying the evaluation process in schools and other organizations. Our work in the area, we felt, gave us a head start in conducting this summary and synthesis. We have developed a theory of evaluation which, among other things, provides an abstract model of the evaluation process.

1. Assigning goals
2. Setting criteria or standards
3. Making observations (sampling performance)
4. Appraising performance
5. Communicating appraisals (feedback)
6. Planning a program for improvement

Our research has convinced us that weaknesses in every step of the evaluation process exist in schools. We believe that the directions for improvement lie in bolstering each step of the process: developing specific evaluation criteria; making frequent evaluations; communicating these evaluations in a clear, straightforward manner; and developing specific programs for improving performances. We hope that this summary of the literature will stimulate practitioners to make a series of efforts designed to effect these and other improvements in school evaluation processes.

The literature is organized here by area of application--the school in general, administrators, teachers, and students. These four areas were further subdivided into three categories of publications: those dealing with theoretical issues, those on policy and political issues, and those oriented toward implementation or practical issues.

Only a small number of books and articles are theoretical--even in a limited sense. Such pieces attempt to draw general conclusions about the process of evaluating persons in schools. Within this category most authors support our own view of the evaluation process as briefly given above. These theoretical works are included to provide a broad overview of the subject.

A greater number of books and articles deal with policy or political issues. These policy papers may focus on purely political factors, such as the power struggles over teacher accountability, or

on factors deriving from more empirically based studies, such as the comparative impact upon performances of the opinions of different evaluators. These articles are included to provide some general guidelines and suggestions.

Finally, the greatest number of books and articles are exclusively practical and concerned with specific implementation techniques. Typically, they present accounts of evaluation systems in use in particular schools or how-to-do-it instructions which can enable others to employ the same system. Works in this category may further be divided into those dealing with methods or systems of evaluation in general and those focusing only on the criteria to be used for evaluation. These references are included to provide practical suggestions on designing and conducting educational evaluation.

The categories presented above are not mutually exclusive, and certain books and articles may be reviewed under more than one category. Neither is the literature reviewed exhaustive of all material on this topic; we have focused on recent publications, particularly those after 1965. And, although we cast our net wide, some worthwhile publications must surely have escaped us. Nevertheless, our survey has proved useful to us in our study of the evaluation process, and we hope it will be helpful to others concerned with this increasingly critical issue.

2. EVALUATION IN SCHOOLS

Theory

In this section we briefly discuss those publications that address issues relevant to evaluation at all levels in the school organization. Because little abstract theoretical study has been done in this area, the number of works in this category is small.

The special need for evaluation of persons is pointed out by several authors. Articles of this sort often originate in interest areas outside of schools. Walker (1972) begins by discussing program

evaluation and notes that even where systematic program evaluation exists, there are often no provisions within the organization that would result in the development and maintenance of desirable staff behaviors.

The use of a general theory of evaluation permits the determination of those processes and problems common to evaluation in all organizations, in schools as a whole, or of individuals filling specific roles. Dornbusch and Scott (1975) and their colleagues have used a general theory of evaluation and authority to examine evaluation practices in various settings such as alternative or free schools (McCauley et al., 1972), a university faculty (Hind et al., 1972), and a preservice teacher-training program (Bryld, 1973). They have examined evaluation systems as they relate to influence upon sanctions, expenditure of effort, visibility of work (Marram et al., 1972), the propriety of authority systems, and the frequency of evaluations (Thompson et al., 1975). They have attempted to relate their abstract theory to evaluation practices in the schools.

Policy

Truly general discussions are difficult to find in policy-oriented literature as well. It is interesting to note that policies for evaluating students are kept distinct from those for evaluating teachers and administrators. Several publications deal with all school personnel except students. DeVaughn (1971b) presents an overview of the problems and premises of teacher and administrator evaluation and cites the major difficulties as lack of attention to evaluation processes, faulty instruments, poorly defined performance criteria, lack of participant involvement, and legal questions. Sarthory (1973) examines Kansas legislation relating to the evaluation of certified school personnel. This legislation requires each school district to develop a written personnel-evaluation policy with the following elements: active involvement of the community in at least the development of policy for staff evaluation; involvement of the

certified staff in this development; active participation of the staff member being evaluated in his or her own evaluation; and the clear delineation of who is to evaluate whom, how, when, and to what end.

Finally, Downey (1974) takes a general look at peer evaluation in organizations. In his study he found that three types of peer evaluations--one rating procedure and two nomination procedures--yielded reliability levels adequate for use in short-range individual evaluations.

Policymakers work by distributing their responsibilities. Thus the descriptions and discussions of their work are presented piece by piece. These people should be encouraged to synthesize the results of their varied experiences and to draw general conclusions and principles. Such efforts will aid and be aided by the development of general theory.

Practice

Just about everyone agrees that evaluation is necessary, and recent pressures on school systems for accountability have increased interest in the establishment of effective evaluation programs. But evaluation remains a difficult task, and the literature fills many education journals and monographs. Several bibliographies about general evaluation in schools are available. Poliakoff (1973) provides a review of literature in the ERIC system. She discusses recent trends, focusing on topics such as the job-targets approach and the client-oriented approach. De Prospo (1971) reviews the literature and concludes that the goals method of evaluation (i.e., having evaluation criteria relate to professional goals) most effectively stimulates professional growth. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management (1973) offers abstracts of publications concerned with competency-based evaluation in schools.

Most of the practical literature aims to make the task of evaluation a little bit easier. Many authors emphasize that evaluation of

educational personnel should be geared toward professional growth, rather than hiring, firing, or promotion. Yet, even if administrators were to remove negative sanctions from the evaluation program, they are stuck with a difficult problem: How is one to assess a teacher, administrator, or student from a limited sample of behavior which may be only remotely related to effectiveness? Student outcomes can easily be observed, but many nondistinguishable factors combine to produce these outcomes. Is it fair to judge a student, teacher, or administrator on the basis of test scores? Nevo (1974) found that although outcomes of educational processes are available for appraisal, students, teachers, and principals agree that evaluative information gathered with specific goals in mind is more important.

Many authors have seen the establishment of goals as the key to a better evaluation system. Frazier and Bedley (1972) trace the implications of the central goal of the Fallbrook, California, school district, "to develop and execute programs which systematically evaluate and improve the effectiveness of student learning," through the development of specific objectives.

The job-target approach, in which evaluator and evaluatee agree on targets that indicate movement toward broader goals, has recently gained popularity. Gray (1975) argues in favor of this approach and discusses its implementation in the Hyde Park, New York, school district. Ingrahorn and Keefe (1972) describe a similar plan in Pennsylvania and offer a list of objectives. They warn, however, that this system may lure participants to choose easily attainable goals rather than the most important goals. The selection of goals is the key feature in this system. The evaluator and evaluatee usually begin with a conference to decide what the evaluatee's role actually involves and what the goals should be. The job-target approach demands cooperation between the evaluator and evaluatee in all aspects of evaluation. MacGregor (1975) emphasizes that constructive feedback to the evaluatee must be an integral part of the evaluation program if performance is to improve.

At a system-wide level, Poore (1972) has designed a chart that relates the establishment of goals and objectives to program-planning budgeting systems (PPBS) and to performance evaluation. The National Education Association (1972) offers instructions for a four-hour simulation of the planning of a system-wide evaluation system. Guidelines are provided for planning and role description.

Another movement that has recently gained popularity is the appraisal of an evaluator by the evaluatee--students evaluate teachers, teachers evaluate principals, and principals evaluate higher level administrators. In 1970 Stemnock published the results of a survey of school systems conducting "client-oriented" evaluation programs in which the evaluatee evaluates the evaluator. She updated this report in 1973 with the responses of 468 systems, revealing that student evaluation of teachers is the method of "client-oriented" evaluation most often practiced. Stemnock provides sample evaluation forms and a bibliography in each article.

As we have already stated, the selection of criteria for appraisal is crucial to any evaluation program. Aside from outcomes, what other measures indicate good performance? Laudicina and Laudicina (1972) suggest the criteria of a "democratic" administrator should include: (a) professional competence, (b) intellectual or personal awareness, (c) sensitivity, (d) program awareness and articulation (i.e., "an understanding of the goals and objectives embodied in the student personnel program"), and (e) initiative.

The study of evaluation as a general process is a relatively recent development. Practical literature on the concerns of evaluators has only recently become available. In the near future we can expect the number of studies and publications in this area to increase rapidly, making the field even more exciting.

3. EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

Theory

We found few publications concerned with theoretical issues in the evaluation of administrators. Indeed, there are only a few articles of a pretheoretical nature, articles that lay the groundwork for theory and discuss evaluation of administrators. This is not surprising since the subject involves the intersection of two largely unexplored areas--the theory of evaluation and the evaluation of administrators.

Those articles and books that do speak to theoretical issues in the evaluation of administrators usually focus on the principal. Slusher (1975), however, deals with the more general position of managers of human resources. He argues that a performance-appraisal process that measures goal achievement provides a broad perspective for the management of human resources.

Two authors examine the dimensions of the principal's role, those aspects of performance that should be appraised under the evaluation system. F. Dyer (1973) uses a pupil-change (input-output) model of the school and states that the principal and the principal's staff are responsible for: (a) knowing where the students stand intellectually, personally, and socially; (b) knowing the conditions that may facilitate or impede the students' development; and (c) using this knowledge to maximize student development toward certain clearly defined and agreed-upon performance objectives.

Along somewhat different lines, Lessinger (1971) sees the role of the principal as made up of four dimensions: an accountable principal combines the dimensions of steward, celebrant, auditor, and entrepreneur. Thus he is one who:

1. Recognizes his stewardship, his management of the parents' educational affairs.

2. Recognizes that he is participating with a religious intensity in the growth and development of children and staff.

3. Really hears, and thus is alert to performance and how it may be improved.

4. Is an entrepreneur for his students' and teachers' benefit, gathering resources, taking risks, organizing and staging the best of which he is capable, like any good impresario.

Considering another perspective, Wilson (1975) points out that the principal himself should be evaluated on the way he evaluates his staff. A content analysis of journal articles and books dealing with principals revealed 53 separate appraisable functions within the responsibility of the principal. These functions were classified into the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains.

From a complementary perspective, Travis (1972) examined the relationship between teacher perceptions of the principal's role and teacher evaluation of the principal. His findings should be considered by anyone planning a system in which a principal is evaluated by staff members. Using both a role-perception instrument that provides for an examination of both ideal and actual role perceptions of the high school principal and the Purdue Rating Scale for Administrators and Executives, Travis found that:

1. When teachers possess convergent perceptions of the principal's actual and ideal role, the teachers tend to evaluate their principal as highly effective.

2. Teachers who perceive the principal's ideal role much as their principal perceives the principal's ideal role are more likely to evaluate their principal as highly effective.

3. Teachers who perceive the principal's actual role much as their principal perceives the principal's actual role do not evaluate their principal as highly effective.

4. Teachers who perceive the actual role of the principal to be similar to the ideal role of the principal evaluate their principal as highly effective.

5. Teachers perceive the principal's ideal role as consisting of task performances which differ from the principal's actual task performances. Teachers would like to deemphasize those tasks which presently are perceived as forming the actual role of the principal.

6. Principals perceive their ideal role as consisting of increased emphasis upon and frequent performance of those tasks they perceive as forming the actual role of the principal.

The lack of any substantial theoretical work on the evaluation of principals or administrators may be attributed in part to the general lack of empirical work in the area. Good theoretical work with applications in this area remains to be done. Such work must pay special attention to the evaluation of the principal in the role of evaluator of those serving on the staff.

Policy

The treatment of policy issues in the evaluation of administrators, like the treatment of theoretical issues, is light and scattered. DePree (1974) discusses how school administrators can be formally evaluated, suggesting that an evaluation plan should integrate supervision and evaluation and that its primary purpose should be to improve administrative performance and stimulate better administrative practices. Of interest to those administering school districts, his paper identifies several possible barriers to the acceptance and adoption of a performance-evaluation program:

1. Administrators often feel that evaluation is something that is done to them and not for them.
2. Many current evaluation systems use a checklist of predetermined qualities which administrators feel are oriented to past practices.
3. There is often a lack of clear definition of job functions.
4. There is a tendency to equate evaluation with observation, and administrators dislike such observation.
5. Administrators lack skills, knowledge, and understanding relative to performance evaluation.
6. It is difficult for many educators to accept the view that performance evaluation, which they associate with business, is appropriate in school.

DePree also suggests strategies to help overcome the barriers to the implementation of such a program. He advises districts to:

1. Seek the support of the superintendent and administrative staff by providing adequate time for such a program.
2. Clarify the job functions of administrators.
3. Involve those who will be evaluated in the design of the evaluation system.
4. Provide in-service training concerning the process of evaluation.
5. Systematically review the program to evaluate administrators at least annually.
6. Do everything possible to keep issues of performance evaluation away from the process of collective bargaining.

DePree's paper is must reading for any district contemplating the implementation of an evaluation system for administrators. Nygaard (1974) recognizes the increased public pressure for evaluation of administrative personnel and, noting that at least nine states now mandate periodic formal evaluations of administrative and supervisory personnel in the public schools, reports on the actions of state legislatures and education agencies.

Examining the evaluation question from the viewpoint of those being evaluated, Pharis (1973) finds that principals want an evaluation system that (a) measures reality, (b) considers only controllable variables, (c) spells out clearly in advance what criteria the principals are to be measured against, (d) is not subject to different conclusions by different evaluators, and (e) permits principals to have some voice in determining goals.

A particularly controversial issue in the evaluation of principals is whether such evaluation should be tied to rewards. The Lake County, Florida, accountability plan offers rewards to principals. Principals can earn yearly bonuses of up to $1,000 under this experimental plan. To qualify for accountability pay, a principal or county

staff member must assess his area of responsibility, determine a specific educational need within that area, and submit a written plan to the superintendent stating the intended goal and methods of attaining it. Other plans employ negative sanctions. Lloyd Turner (1971) reports on the plan for the evaluation of the superintendent used by the Fort Worth, Texas, board of education. Their plan includes the penalty of dismissal for unacceptable performance.

A major theme running through much of the policy literature on administrator evaluation is that the principal is caught "in the middle." Nolte (1974) sums up one aspect of the dilemma of the principal by pointing out that:

> While the board can fire a superintendent and the superintendent can get a principal fired, a principal who rattles his sabre disturbs few people--certainly not the teachers who are job protected by tenure or union. (p. 29)

Estes (1971) notes the incongruity of the fact that principals are being held accountable at the same time they are losing power to judges, boards of education, superintendents, teachers' groups, students, and parents--the very groups that want the principal held accountable.

Along similar lines, English and Zaharis (1972) argue that the principal's power and influence are being undermined. They note that:

1. The increasing specialization of teachers has eroded much of the technical authority that was formerly the domain solely of principals.

2. Principals are pressured by expanding specialization in central district offices in the form of directors, consultants, supervisors, coordinators, and specialists.

3. Principals deemphasize their professional links to teachers and are acting as managers as a result of collective bargaining.

As a solution to this plight, Nicholson (1972) advocates that the principal take the initiative. He sees this initiative stemming from increased proficiency in the development, implementation, and evaluation of performance objectives and specifies three steps a principal should take to achieve such proficiency:

1. The establishment of a strong frame of reference for the development of performance objectives,

2. The development of the ability to create a viable hierarchy of administrative task areas in which to devote time and energy,

3. The acquisition of skill in applying techniques for analyzing administrative performance.

While the acquisition of these skills may be helpful to the principal under fire, a more effective method of escaping from the plight of getting caught "in the middle" would, we believe, be the development of linked systems of performance evaluation up and down the system, from the level of the superintendent to the level of the students. Such systems would more equitably distribute the demands of accountability. Work in this area seems to require a more inclusive approach, one that takes into account the factors and forces affecting the person who is playing the role of principal.

Practice

The evaluation of principals presents a unique practical problem. Unlike teachers and students, principals have no evaluators working with them on a day-to-day basis; the superintendent and board of education are their only superiors, and they rarely see principals in action. These supervisors must somehow distinguish the productivity of the principals from that of the teachers in order to evaluate them both. Are higher reading scores the result of the principal's efforts, the teacher's efforts, or both?

Collegial evaluation is one solution. William Castelter and Richard Heisler (1971) apply principles of performance appraisal from industrial management and the behavioral sciences to the evaluation of school administrators. They suggest that a team of administrators be trained to appraise their colleagues, using specific objectives.

A publication of the Ohio Association of Elementary School Principals (1971) splits evaluation of administrators into two parts:

job performance and professional growth. They offer sample evaluation instruments geared specifically to the elementary principal, including a self-evaluation form. J. Everette DeVaughn (1971b) also presents sample evaluation instruments, "designed to measure professional growth and service in meeting stated goals." DeVaughn breaks down goals to standards which are then measured by "behavioral evidence." Self-evaluation is another solution to the problem of appraising the isolated principal. Rosenberg (1973) offers a step-by-step plan for the evaluation of principals and emphasizes self-evaluation as part of the total program.

Cooperation between the evaluator and administrator in establishing objectives for performance and criteria to measure the achievement of these objectives seems to be a universal theme. George Redfern (1972b) feels principals can and should be measured by performance objectives, which are targets set by the administrator with his evaluator. Culbertson (1971) and Culbertson et al., eds. (1974) stress the leadership role of the principal, and the latter paper offers performance objectives to test this quality. Keegan and Forsythe (1972) discuss planning an accountability program for evaluating principals on the basis of performance objectives; Rooney (1973) describes such a program in Ventura, California.

Selecting criteria that are both observable and valid often poses the most difficult problem for the evaluator of the administrator. Lynn Turner (1974) writes that the evaluation of administrators must be grounded on performance-based criteria. These sets of criteria should be used when the potential administrator applies to graduate school and when he or she applies for a job, as well as when already employed. Gale and McCleary (1972) also propose the use of the same criteria in training and in service, and they report on a study of the validity of some sets of criteria, such as the principal's familiarity with public relations and with instruction.

Melton and Stanavage (1970) describe specific aspects of the principal's role that may be helpful in formulating criteria for appraisal, for instance, implementing and accepting policies, and

developing good interpersonal relationships with parents, students, and teachers. They add that the principal should accept accountability "for the overall effectiveness of the school." But more than half of the teachers answering an opinion poll about the role of the principal ("What Is the Role of the Principal" [1971]) disagree. They say that the principal should not be held accountable for student progress.

Descriptive articles on particular systems for the evaluation of administrators are sometimes worth examining. Beall (1972), Carvell (1972), Dubuque Community School District (1973), Hawkins (1972), Hoffner (1972), and Peebles (1973) all present case studies of the evaluation of administrators in different school systems. The article "Here Is How" (1974), Coats (1974), and P. Jones (1974) describe an accountability-based evaluation program used in Kalamazoo, Michigan. The Educational Research Service (1971) conducted a thorough survey of eleven schools across the United States focusing on administrator-evaluation procedures, and the report should be of interest to school districts.

Another solution to the problem of evaluating the isolated principal is to have the teachers conduct the evaluation. Should teachers evaluate principals? Three out of four teachers say yes, according to the National Education Association, Research Division (1971). W. L. Gaslin (1974) describes such a program used at a high school in Minneapolis. Since the school superintendent is generally the principal's only evaluator, some consideration should be given to the superintendent's role. Harris (1973) analyzes the superintendent's role as an evaluator of administrators.

Finally, two bibliographies are helpful in grappling with the practical issues in the evaluation of administrators. Terry Barraclough (1973) reviews recent literature on the evaluation of administrators, and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management (1974) cites 23 articles concerning the evaluation of administrators.

Setting goals and criteria for evaluation obviously presents difficult problems with respect to the evaluation of administrators, but the question of who the evaluator should be is equally difficult

to solve. The principal is an isolate; only the teachers view the principal every day. The superintendent and the board of education rarely observe the principal at work. At best, they may see a representative sample of his or her performance. The literature treats the question of teacher evaluation of principals, but few articles suggest methods of increasing administrator visibility to superiors or colleagues.

In sum, the literature focusing on the evaluation of principals stimulates some interesting questions but provides few guidelines for devising new evaluation systems or procedures. If it is true that teacher evaluation is still in the dark ages of development, then principal evaluation is in the stone age.

From a theoretical standpoint, there is little agreement on what aspects of a principal's role should provide the criteria for evaluation. Should the principal be evaluated on the overall performance of the school? Should specific dimensions of the principal's role become the focus of evaluation? Should the principal be evaluated on his or her evaluations of the teaching staff? What aspects of the principal's performance are linked to his or her own effectiveness? What aspects are linked to the school's effectiveness? From a policy standpoint, there is some consensus on the increasing pressures for administrative evaluation and on the unenviable position of the principal in the jaws of the vise. Some strategies have been proposed to meet demands for principal accountability without further undermining the principal's role. But, for any strategy, there are existing barriers that make implementation extremely difficult.

The practical literature on administrator evaluation offers a wealth of tips and suggestions and advocates evaluation systems based on specific situations. Performance criteria have been developed for principals; instruments have been devised to measure their task performance; the participation of principals as well as teachers in the process has been discussed; and the use of peer systems--where principals evaluate each other--has been suggested. Without an

adequate conceptual framework and consensus on general policy issues, however, it is impossible to know the conditions under which these specific suggestions can be generalized. Much more work is needed in order to identify salient features and to outline the conditions under which the evaluation of principals can lead to their improved performance.

4. EVALUATION OF TEACHERS

Theory

Theoretical literature on the evaluation of teachers, like that on the evaluation of principals, is sparse. Only ten publications that may be considered theoretical in the formal sense have been identified. Although they do not present a set of logically related propositions that seek to explain some aspect of the evaluation process, these ten publications lay the groundwork for the development of theoretical propositions and typically perform one of two functions: either they examine the need to evaluate, thereby providing some basic objectives for teacher evaluation, or they attempt to break the evaluation process into component parts by searching for abstract dimensions of evaluation or by proposing models of evaluation. Three of the ten articles are in the form of annotated bibliographies or bibliographic essays that synthesize materials.

For the theorist, the major interest lies in the organizing themes of the bibliographic works. Blount, comp. (1974) organizes the literature under three interrelated frames of reference: the purposes of evaluation, the criteria for evaluation, and the evaluators. Morsh and Wilder (1954), in their review of 360 references, divide articles into two categories: "Criteria for Instructor Effectiveness," which includes rating by administrator, rating by peer, rating by student, self-rating, objective observation of performance, and measures of student change; and "The Predictors--Traits and Qualities Assumed to be Related to Instructor Effectiveness," which includes intelligence,

education, scholarship, age and experience, knowledge of subject matter, and professional information and attitudes. Ryans (1971), following a review of existing research, advocates that attention be paid to qualities of teaching relating to student characteristics and behaviors and to the effects that may be inferred to result from identifiable experiences in teacher education.

The professional status of teachers is an issue that has been closely associated with teacher evaluation. Teachers have fought to be recognized as professionals, a status that connotes a certain amount of freedom from monitoring. Thus, teacher evaluation is often considered a threat to teachers' ideas of professionalism. Olds (1974), one of the few supporters of performance evaluation for teachers to address this issue, challenges claims of professionalism and the myth that colleges and universities turn out teachers (and administrators) as finished products guaranteed to work satisfactorily in any school district. Covert (1975) questions teachers' desires for increased professionalism by exploring certain facets of the professional model that teachers might find unattractive. Among these are the threat of malpractice litigation, the responsibilities of a profession if entry into that profession is not controlled, the dominant position of the professional in relation to the client, and the shroud of secrecy accompanying professionalization.

The differences between the professional model of teachers and the model implied by current teacher-evaluation practices is highlighted by Rice (1973), who points out that when principals are called upon to evaluate teachers, the out-of-role behavior of teachers is an important determinant in the principals' assessment of dispositional properties related to role behavior of teachers. Such out-of-role behaviors do not typically play a part in the evaluation of professionals.

In a more general article, Stones and Morris (1972) note that a weakness in the present system of assessing teacher practices is the diversity of methods of assessment. Wilson and Smith (1974) specify

two major purposes of evaluation: the improvement of instruction, and the documentation of inadequate instruction. They advocate that we pay more attention to improvement as the purpose of evaluation.

Considering a different facet of evaluation, Corwin (1968) examines the focus of evaluations and discusses the different effects of evaluations of techniques and evaluations of outcomes. He writes that:

> When subordinates are lauded for their conforming to specific operating rules, these practices become transformed into sacred rituals by employees who, having once mastered them, resist their modification. . . . On the other hand, when employees are evaluated in terms of results rather than the techniques they have mastered, the use of initiative and experimentation with alternative methods is encouraged to a greater extent. (p. 7)

A number of articles are more directly concerned with the dimensions of teacher evaluation, and some of these deal with teacher effectiveness. Orlosky (1973) discusses factors that influence the selection of competency criteria and points out the difficulty of preparing teachers to perform competently if those criteria are not specified. Bohlken and Griffin (1970), in their presentation of a model for determining the effectiveness of high school teachers, focus on communication and interpersonal trust. Trust is broken down into elements of expertness, character, dynamism (as perceived by students), and achievement of course objectives.

Perhaps the most thorough examination of the dimensions of teacher effectiveness is that of Hunter (1973). She has broken down the teaching process into eleven discrete but interrelated components:

1. Deliberate separation of genuine educational constraints from the ethnic, financial, intellectual, or emotional excuses that constitute typical and acceptable excuses for learning failure.

2. Determination of what a student has already learned and what he or she is ready to learn.

3. Identification of productive learning behavior for achieving a particular learning task for a particular learner.

4. Determination of an instructional objective that is specific in context and perceivable in terms of learned behavior.

5. Identification of the principles of learning that are relevant to the accomplishment of the instructional objective.

6. Adaptation of those principles to the particular situation of each learner.

7. Incorporation of professional ethics as the teacher uses his or her attributes plus his or her competence in the specific learning area in order to enhance the learner's probability of success.

8. Synthesis of decisions 1 through 7 in the deliberate design or blueprint for a teaching-learning episode.

9. Teacher's observation of the learner in order to augment or correct the decision-making process.

10. Constant monitoring of the learner's progress to yield essential current information that may modify or validate the design for learning.

11. On the basis of evaluative data, teacher must decide whether to reteach, practice and extend, move on, or abandon ship if the objective is not appropriate for the learner at the time.

These components can be the elements of a teacher-training and teacher-evaluation program.

Moving away from discussions of the dimensions of teaching, we find a few articles on the dimensions of the evaluation process itself. Medley et al. (1975) distinguish four assessment levels in a teacher's professional development: level 1, assessments of training experience; level 2, assessments of the teacher's behavior; level 3, assessments of the pupil's behavior; and level 4, assessments of instruction. They maintain that level 2 is the most appropriate for teacher evaluation.

From a different perspective, the report of the Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio (1972) recommends that evaluation be concerned with the subject matter being taught and the skills of those conducting the evaluation. Bowman (1971) distinguishes between teacher evaluation in the cognitive and emotional spheres,

finding more agreement on cognitive matters. Harmon et al. (1975) present an instrument designed to determine teacher attitudes toward elements of the process of evaluating classroom teaching. The most comprehensive discussion of dimensions of an evaluation system is Stemnock's (1972b) national review of systems for teacher evaluation; she discusses purposes of evaluation, frequency of evaluation, specific evaluators, evaluation procedures, and appeal procedures.

Evaluation as an element in the relationship between teachers and their superiors is the subject of a number of articles. By far, the greatest attention is devoted to the principal as an evaluator of teachers. Thompson et al. (1975) discuss the failure of communication in the evaluation of teachers by principals. They place additional emphasis on the low frequency of principal evaluation and the associated teacher dissatisfaction. Teachers do not find the evaluation system helpful in providing guidance in their teaching tasks. Rather, teachers report relative ignorance of the criteria and samples on which principals base their evaluation. Further, Thompson and her colleagues found that the lower the frequency of communicated evaluations reported by teachers, the more dissatisfied were the teachers and the less helpful were the evaluations in improving the quality of teaching. These results suggest that an increase in the frequency of evaluations would increase teacher satisfaction, increase the teachers' beliefs that evaluations could provide helpful guidance, and not be perceived as a threat to their professional autonomy.

In a follow-up study, Dornbusch et al. (1976) explored other problems that arise as the principal evaluates teachers. They found that principals are the most influential and important evaluators of teachers but that principals are not satisfied with the system for evaluating. In addition to the communication problems already mentioned, they note the failure of the evaluation system to operate in ways that support the principal's control of teachers on tasks that principals deem more important. The system of rewards and penalties based on evaluation is insufficiently important to teachers. Finally,

they find that both teachers and principals are in agreement on the need for increased ability of teachers to affect the criteria and samples of teaching behavior on which principals base their evaluations.

Redfern (1972a) discusses the attitude of the principal toward evaluation and his or her vital role in the evaluation process (including the use of evaluation outcomes for administrative action). J. Williams (1970) investigated the relationship between teacher ratings of the principal and systems for teacher evaluation. He found that principals who adhered to a district-prescribed appraisal system were rated higher than those who did not adhere to the system, a finding consistent with the more general notion that teachers welcome systematic evaluation. Payne (1974) studied the relationship between teacher-principal consensus relative to the teacher's role and the perceived quality of the principal's evaluation of the teacher and found no significant correlation. Chan (1973), however, found a significant positive relationship between agreement of principals' and teachers' philosophies with respect to educational practices and positive views of teacher evaluation. Looking at the elements of the evaluation system, Stinson (1971) found significant differences of opinion between teachers and principals on three criteria of teacher evaluation: efforts to improve professional competence, pupil participation in learning, and reliability of evaluation instruments.

As was the case with the evaluation of principals, several writers have dealt with aspects of collegial evaluation. Swanson (1974b), in a study of military instructor pilots, examined the ratings of teaching made by superiors, students, peers, and the instructors themselves, and found that peer ranking and rating of teaching in terms of leadership style was the most accurate approach to evaluation. In a more analytic mode, Caldwell (1971) lists characteristics of a collegial evaluation plan that emphasizes improving teacher performance rather than criticizing mistakes. Among the characteristics are: evaluators should be teammates who see each other in diverse situations over

extended periods of time, evaluators should be of service in helping to solve problems, and evaluators should be evaluated by those whom they evaluate.

Marram, Dornbusch, and Scott (1972) found that elementary school teachers had little respect for evaluations of their teaching by other teachers. One reason for this skepticism was the teachers' low estimate of the value of professional knowledge, skill, and training. A second factor, related to the organization of schools, was the lack of visibility of teachers' work to each other. An increase in the visibility of work, brought about by team teaching and open schools, increased the perceived validity of evaluations of that work, and valid evaluations were more important to those being evaluated. The authors suggested that the increased use of open schools and teaming may lead to greater use of collegial evaluation systems.

In a report on two field tests of a collegial evaluation program for professional development, Roper, Deal, and Dornbusch (1976) note that teachers can and will help each other perform better at their jobs. The most difficult part of the program for teachers was in selecting criteria to serve as bases for evaluations. Nevertheless, most teachers did select criteria that were specific, observable, and meaningful to them. Thinking about criteria not only helped teachers assess areas for improvement, but also helped them to clarify their goals as teachers. On the whole, the teachers reacted favorably to collegial evaluation, adapted programs to fit their unique circumstances, and gained new respect for their colleagues as they developed a program for professional growth.

In two articles, McKenna attempts to place teacher evaluation in a broader perspective. In "A Context for Teacher Evaluation" (1973a) he presents a paradigm for program, evaluator performance, evaluation, and the evaluation of outcomes. He shows how the evaluation of teaching performance is related to aspects of the program--such as student and staff characteristics and facilities--and to learning outcomes--such as skills, aptitudes, and attitudes of students. In the

second article, "Teacher Evaluation: Some Implications" (1973b), he points out that the scope of evaluation in education is much broader than just evaluation of teachers and that teacher evaluation in isolation will be fragmented, inconsistent, and unjust.

While the theoretical work on the evaluation of teachers is better developed than that on the evaluation of principals, a great deal remains to be investigated. Particular attention should be paid to student outcomes in the process of teacher evaluation.

Policy

In the area of policy, the key word in teacher evaluation is "accountability." Numerous articles have been written concerning teacher accountability. Earle (1973) makes the point that the source of this push for accountability is a public that has lost confidence in those who staff schools. Alkin (1972) provides a definition of accountability as a "negotiated relationship in which the participants agree in advance to accept specific rewards and costs on the basis of evaluation findings as to the attainment of specific ends." Hammons (1975) speaks of accountability in terms of job assignments, areas for improvement, and assured assistance from leadership. Several bibliographies on the topic provide further help in describing the range of topics which appear under the rubric of accountability. The National Education Association, Division of Instruction (1973b) has compiled a list of 29 articles, books, and essays published since 1970 on the concept of accountability in education. O'Donnell (1974) uses the format of a review of the literature to discuss 12 articles related to accountability for English teachers. The National Association of Secondary School Principals (1974) has compiled a bibliography to assist principals and others in clarifying the concept of accountability. The material is presented in four areas of accountability--financial, pupil testing, personnel evaluation, and general.

The dimensions of personnel evaluation having policy implications are discussed by several authors. Alkin (1972) classifies accounta-

bility programs in terms of the person held accountable, the person to whom one is held accountable, and the subject of accountability. He maintains that school boards are accountable for goals and objectives, administrators are accountable for programs, and teachers are accountable for outcomes. Krasno (1972) seeks to relate research on teacher effectiveness to the accountability process--the concept of good leaders, the complexity of the teaching-learning process, the limitations of outcome measurement, and the importance of long-range outcomes.

Accountability programs based on student outcomes are the subject of great controversy in the field. Alkin and Klein (1972) present dos and don'ts for an accountability program based on outcomes. They note that a good system for teacher evaluation should not require subjective judgments of principals or panels but instead should employ objective measures of student performance which control for previous student skill levels, student socioeconomic status, and possible fault in the prescribed curriculum. In addition, they suggest that such objective measures be sensitive to the goals of a particular school. As a less costly alternative, they recommend performance tests for curriculum units in which students have had no previous instruction. Teachers would be given a fixed amount of time to teach a unit, and student performance would be assessed at the end of the period. Such a system must have strict security in order to prevent the teacher from "teaching for the test." Basic to the use of such tests is the assumption that outcomes on these short-run tests will correlate with teaching ability using a longer time scale. Finally, Alkin and Klein stress the importance of setting standards or criteria by which to judge teacher effectiveness.

The use of behavioral objectives in systems of accountability is the focus of a number of articles. Meade (1973) argues for an accountability system based on establishing suitable experiences compatible with proper objectives for a subject. Popham (1972b), a leading proponent of behavioral objectives, argues that the principal as an evaluator must become aware of real and specious assessment of teacher

performances and that the use of behavioral objectives is the best way to get valid measures. Ovard (1975) notes that a recurring theme in educational research has been the attempt to make teacher evaluation more objective, and he interprets the current attempts to link accountability with performance-based objectives as the latest phase of that theme.

The design of accountability programs is only half of the process. The effects of the introduction of accountability systems are the subject of several policy-related articles. Ferrera (1974) examined school districts in Northern California following the introduction of the accountability programs mandated by the Stull Act. He found that:

1. There is agreement among school personnel and board members that a) all certified personnel should be evaluated, and b) student performance is the main criterion for evaluating teacher effectiveness.

2. School personnel and board members argue that external procedures and administrative behavior have changed as a result of the Stull Act.

3. School administrators and board members perceive that teacher evaluation has improved as a result of the Stull Act, whereas teachers perceive no improvement as a result of the Stull Act.

Crucial to the successful implementation of any accountability program is the acceptance and support of such a program by the teachers.

Zelenak (1973) studied teacher perceptions of teacher accountability and found that teachers who feel that evaluation is for instructional purposes are supportive of it, while those who feel that evaluation is utilized mainly for administrative purposes (tenure, promotion, dismissal, assignment, salary, and permanent records) tend to view the process negatively.

Accountability from the viewpoint of the teacher is also the subject of two papers by the National Education Association's Division of Instruction. One of these (1973a) examines the broader aspects of accountability, details specific state legislation for assessment and accountability, and suggests strategies for teacher associations that

must operate under restrictive legislation. The other (1972) lists six elements to be considered when attempting to assess learning outcomes: established goals, regular assessment of students, varied and individualized programs, established criteria, abundant resources, and the nature of governance. It also suggests that teachers can prevent enactment of unfair accountability laws by such actions as identifying the responsibility of other groups in education and by seeing that accountability measures become regulations of state departments of education.

Teachers, as well as those who act as advocates for teachers' rights, are often involved in defining the limits of an accountability program. Such specified limits are important factors in determining whether or not teachers will support the system. Ray (1974) gives his opinion as to the conditions under which teachers should be accountable, taking the view that accountability should serve as a basis for the improvement of teaching. Bidwell (1965) suggests that accountability should be a means of improving instruction and renewing professionalism. He notes that the measurement of student achievement would be improved by initiating positive feedback based on minimum performance objectives. If this is done, accountability should elevate problems of communication between the various levels of instruction.

Other members of the school community may be affected by the introduction of an accountability program. Looking at an often neglected member of the school's professional staff--the supervisor--Brodbelt (1972) describes the changes in the supervisor's role that are likely to result with the introduction of an accountability system. Special reference is made to evaluation, performance contracts, and changing teacher behavior.

Moving from teacher accountability to the more general and less politically charged topic of teacher evaluation, there seems to be less policy-related literature. DeVaughn (1973) discusses the legal aspects of due process in teacher evaluation and points out that evaluation systems must be fair if school boards are to be less vulnerable

to attacks in the courts. McKenna (1973b) argues that any evaluation system will be ineffective unless the system is tied to the allocation of time, talent, and money in a school district. Finally, in presenting a union advocate's view, Feldman (1972) calls for a revision of standards for teacher evaluation and replacement of the existing subjective standards. Among her suggestions are:

1. Improve preservice programs for teacher preparation (with emphasis on performance rating and field experience).
2. Involve experienced teachers in programs of teacher education.
3. Refine procedures for teacher selection through follow-up studies prepared by the school systems.
4. Revise certification and licensing exams to provide more objective tests for selection.

Few articles in the literature deal both with design of a system of teacher evaluation and with the implementation of that design. The school leader who attempts to handle one without considering the other is likely to encounter great difficulty. Publications reporting on the interaction of these problem areas are badly needed, since such material would consider how school leaders can reach a compromise between the desirable and the feasible.

Practice

Anyone who attempts to sample the literature describing current systems of teacher evaluation will be overwhelmed by its abundance. We can only note the numerous summaries and partial reviews.

Baral, comp. (1974) and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Administration (1971) may help the researcher sift through published and unpublished information, since both offer details about price and availability of documents, as well as brief abstracts. Mueller (1971) describes the literature up to that year, stressing student outcomes and differences in teaching environments. She also includes an annotated list of references.

General books and articles discussing problems and approaches to teacher evaluation include: Anderson and Hunka (1963), Beller (1971), Burkhart, ed. (1969), Deneen et al. (1972), Guthrie and Willover (1973), Lavelle (1972), "NJEA Speaks Out" (1971), the Ohio Education Association (1970), and Roth and Mahoney (1975).

Numerous publications address specific problems. Nuspel (1973) deals with the problem of objectivity in evaluating teachers. Elmore (1974) discusses the use of "objective" and "subjective" criteria for the evaluation of teachers from 1890-1973. Dropkin (1973) explains "the combination of competence and effectiveness in evaluating teacher performance." Drumheller (1974) argues that too many administrators look at criteria that are easily observed rather than at those that are valid. Bush (1973) discusses the influence of student subcultures on evaluation instruments. Brooks and Levinson (1974) criticize the use of questionnaires in evaluation.

Many authors suggest definite evaluation systems and offer "how-to" instructions. The National School Public Relations Association (1974), McNally (1972), Hannon and Kralik (1973), and A. Jones (1972) emphasize that evaluation programs should aim to improve teaching. After observing the teacher, the evaluator should offer suggestions for improvement in a conference. Goals and criteria should be established cooperatively by teachers and administrators before assessment begins. Frison (1972) emphasizes the importance of observation. He says that because teaching is a personal matter, the evaluation process should also be personal. According to Israel (1969), observations should be frequent; evaluations should not be based on isolated events.

For any evaluation program to be successful, the administrator and the teacher must agree on what a teacher should be. Alvir (1975) defines five teacher roles as the basis for evaluation: (1) classroom facilitator, (2) resource person, (3) academic advisor, (4) nonacademic liaison, and (5) researcher-innovator. His evaluation instrument takes account of these roles, as well as such traits as creativity and initiative. Bradley et al. (1964) also discuss evaluation in

terms of teacher roles. They describe a selection of six teacher roles as the "California Definition." Washington (1971) offers another definition of what good teaching involves. She describes the "Expert Teacher Action Program," which defines a set of teaching standards with 25 variables. Her book also includes instruction for classroom observation.

Several plans for teacher evaluation have been accepted and successful. The Redfern (1972a) approach, also known as the job-targets approach, has recently gained popularity. First, the evaluator and evaluatee have a conference to establish job targets based on broad educational goals. After the evaluator has assessed the teacher's performance, they meet again to discuss ways to improve teaching and to establish new targets. Armstrong (1973) argues that the Redfern approach should be adopted and presents a description of this approach directed to teachers.

Along slightly different lines, Hunter (1974) presents an assessment instrument developed at UCLA based on Piaget's theories. Hunter (1973) suggests that the evaluator should observe the teacher teach one lesson to a student who has been pretested on the subject matter. Afterward, the student should be re-evaluated. At the end of the process, the evaluator has both a measure of the teacher's success and assessments made during observation. The combination may help to spot areas for improvement in the teacher's performance.

Popham (1972a) proposes a similar test of teacher performances. The students would be tested before and after the teacher presents a lesson. Popham stresses that this method would be more objective than classroom observation, but without observation the evaluator may have difficulty in pointing to specific areas a teacher should work on. Popham (1971) applies this method to the requirements of the Stull Bill, the California law that has increased the need for evaluation programs by mandating teacher assessment. King and Jordan (1972) offer another evaluation plan geared toward the Stull Bill which includes suggested forms and schedules.

Since people themselves make observations, evaluations can only be as objective as the people who make them. One way to make evaluations more objective is to allow the same piece of behavior to be observed by different people. Baltus (1974) suggests television taping of behavior to be evaluated. The principal and the teacher can then go over the tape together. Case and Brown (1970) also suggest a videotape which can be played repeatedly for the teacher and his or her colleagues.

Time and money may not be available for such expensive techniques. In fact, in recent times, many schools have found themselves under such severe financial pressure that they must fire some teachers. Time constraints typically accompany such pressures, leaving no resources for conventional processes of evaluation. To deal with such a situation, Harvey (1974) recommends a backward process of rating teachers, using broad criteria such as "quality of teaching," and then observing only those teachers with low ratings in order to determine who should be fired. Harvey believes that if several people agree on a rating, even without observation, their consensus approaches a valid observational measure.

Those who frequently observe teachers in action are the students, but unfortunately most of the literature on evaluation by students relates to a college situation rather than one in elementary or secondary schools. Jacobson (1973) feels students have the most "accurate perception of classroom atmosphere and teacher performance." She and her students created an evaluation instrument that includes statements for students to use in scoring teachers, such as, "You give the right amount of homework," or "You include us in the planning of your program." Shaw (1973) and Hasson (1967) both recommend student evaluation of teachers, but Bejar (1975) warns that research on the validity of such evaluations may not justify using the results for personnel decisions. Pettman (1970) has put together an annotated bibliography of articles published between 1965-70 concerning student evaluation of teachers. Although some teachers would rather not rely on a student's evaluation of their behavior, they feel less uncomfortable

with a system of collegial evaluation. Roper, Deal, and Dornbusch (1976) have written an informative account of a study of collegial evaluation among student teachers at Stanford University.

Again, specific case studies are helpful. Davis (1974), Fox (1971), Frees (1972), Freese (1975), Hillerich (1972), Hoak (1972), Koble (1971), Lill (1970), Miller (1974), Newlin (1972), Shearron and Johnson (1973), Sinha (1962), Thomas (1972), Thornsley (1972), Toker (1965), Voege (1970), and Williams (1972) describe various teacher evaluation programs in the United States. The model used in Kalamazoo, Michigan, is the subject of "Ready? Let's Open That Can of Worms" (1974), Coats (1975), and the Kalamazoo Public Schools (1974). Abstracts of 13 different teacher evaluation systems are available in National Education Association, Division of Instruction (1973c).

Many administrators see self-evaluation as an essential element of any evaluation system. Olds (1973) agrees. He argues that any formulation of performance objectives involves a substantial degree of the teacher's own self-evaluation and offers instructions for developing a self-evaluation program. Detzner (1974) suggests that videotaping provides a "nonthreatening" means of self-evaluation. As stated previously, to successfully design and implement a teacher evaluation system requires the cooperation of the teachers involved. Moreover, the school staff at all levels must participate in planning. Spears (1974), Lindley (1962), and Thistle (1955) discuss how to plan teacher evaluation programs. Lindley and Spears stress cooperation in developing guidelines, and Spears favors an accountability system employing self-evaluation.

In two separate studies of teacher perception of evaluation programs, Eads (1974) found that teachers prefer a "supervision by objectives" model, and Nieburg (1970) found that both teachers and administrators like a performance-factor list like the one developed by the National Education Association (1972). Such a performance-factor list requires the careful selection of the proper criteria for

evaluation. The professional nature of teaching makes this a difficult problem. Because students differ in skills and background when they enter a class, and because teaching techniques vary greatly, no single measure can express how good a teacher is. Taneman (1970) considers pupil gain as a criterion. Scott (1972) recommends the review of classroom assignments. Swanson (1974a) proposes criteria to measure leadership qualities in teachers. Brown (1973) describes criteria for science teachers. McFadden (1970) reports on the results of "Project D," which developed a system of appraisal based on standards of effective teaching along with a self-evaluation instrument. Cameron (1973) finds that principals, teachers, and school board members define student achievement as the major objective for student growth and that student growth is a more reliable measure than observational ratings for use in teacher evaluation.

Eye (1975) examines the roles of the superintendent with respect to teacher evaluation. He defines four: mediator of expectations, designer of evaluative attack, criterion evaluator, and responsible accumulator.

Because they are not typically considered classroom teachers, school counselors escape the notice of evaluators. Since counselors perform an important function in the school, this is clearly a mistake. Ferris (1971) and Anderson et al. (1967) offer guidelines for the evaluation of school counselors. Stewart (1974) suggests some criteria for the evaluation of counselors. Dunlop (1971) discusses three different methods of counselor evaluation: (a) involving practitioners in training, (b) encouraging practicing counselors to be their own evaluators, and (c) creating ethics and standards committees. Eckstein (1974) finds that client ratings of counselors improve their performance and are generally higher than ratings by experts. Percival (1974) has developed a list of 180 criteria for evaluating counselors.

Publications on the subject of teacher evaluation are certainly numerous, but few readable, comprehensive handbooks exist that can be

readily applied to a school district. Many of the plans involve much time and effort. Many authors seem anxious to espouse more objective programs of evaluation. But regardless of what the ideal situation might be, evaluation of teachers by principals is the most common form of evaluation and must be improved if the total process of teacher evaluation is to be made more satisfactory.

In summary, the literature on the evaluation of teachers, although bountiful in size and scope, suffers from an accumulation of unresolved issues. Theoretically, the process of evaluating teachers is still plagued with basic questions: Are teachers subject to professional or bureaucratic evaluation processes? What are the critical aspects of a teacher's classroom performance? How are teaching techniques related to learning outcomes? Should teachers be evaluated on performances or outcomes, and who should be involved in the evaluation of a teacher's performance?

From a policy perspective, teacher evaluation is intricately tied to the general concern for increased accountability in the field of education. The accountability issue has undoubtedly contributed to the sheer volume of material on the evaluation of teachers. But this contribution has also served to cloud the purposes behind teacher evaluation and to politicize the implementation of evaluation systems designed to improve the quality of teacher evaluation.

5. EVALUATION OF STUDENTS

Theory

When we turn to the evaluation of students, our work immediately seems to be cast in a different light. Frequent student evaluation is an active part of the normal routine of schools in a way that evaluation of teachers and administrators is not. Evaluation of students is not usually discussed at the same time as the evaluation of teachers and administrators. But because we view the school as a system, we feel that this practice has some problems. There are features of the

evaluation process that are common at every level of school organization. The evaluation of students differs from the evaluation of school personnel, however, because pressures for student evaluation greater. These pressures are inherent in the transitory nature of role of the student. A teacher who is not evaluated continues to be a teacher; for lack of a decision, the status quo is maintained. On the other hand, an eighth grader who is not evaluated cannot continue to be an eighth grader; he or she must move through the particular school and out into other institutions of the society. Persons in their student careers are more likely to be evaluated than are people in settled and stable positions.

Although the pressure for evaluating students is great, it does not necessarily mean that a great deal of theoretical work has been done on the topic. Perhaps because the problems of student evaluation are so pressing, only a few people have examined the general area in a thoughtful manner. Weinrauch and Matejka (1973) conducted a study that revealed that greater communication between teachers and students reduces students' false estimations of their course grades and thus reduces students' negative evaluations of their teachers. Wolf (1971), noting some inadequacies of outcome-based systems of evaluation, advocates that student evaluation take place within a transactional context. He maintains that evaluation should disclose the results of the individual's learning experience, look for the causes of success or failure, and assign appropriate responsibility. Friend and W[illegible] examined the evaluation of students from the perspectiv[illegible] theory. They found that both social class and race [illegible] tional patterns. The poor performance of lower-cl[illegible] seen as being attributed to high ability and lo[illegible] children were seen as attributing to themselv[illegible] explaining their performance in terms of luck.

Differences in teacher evaluations of stu[illegible] dent's race are the subject of two other article[illegible] Massey, [illegible] Dornbusch (1975) and Fernández, Espinosa, and Dornbusch (1975) found

that teachers respond to low academic performance from Black and Chicano students by being nice to the students rather than by presenting them with the challenging standards they present to Anglo students. The use of warmth and praise by teachers in response to poor performance by Black and Chicano students guarantees continued poor performance. The teachers produced a faulty evaluation system which led the students to self-delusion about their level of effort and achievement.

Grading or marking has been the traditional means of evaluating students. Hoffman (1974) examines rationales for grading systems in light of the principles of learning. He notes that the practice of using improvement as a source of grades ignores the fact that improvement is easier at some stages than at others, and that it is harder for good students to improve. Using the normal curve as a source of marks is also inappropriate, for a teacher is not likely to get a random sample of abilities in a class. Hoffman also comments on the frequency of evaluation, noting that too-frequent evaluation discourages student response. With respect to grades as a source of motivation, he points out that grades may motivate some but not all students, and he mentions the need for moving to a more intrinsic form of motivation. In designing evaluation systems, Hoffman argues, teachers should make sure that the evaluations encourage students to adopt the right patterns of work and that the exercises to be evaluated are learning experiences in themselves. Whatever system is used, Hoffman urges that the results of the evaluation be communicated quickly and discussed with the student.

Clearly, more theoretical work needs to be done in this area. A look at the professional literature for teachers, along with that portion of the psychological and social science literature dealing with learning and sanctions, might be a good place to start in the development of a theory.

Policy

Many interesting articles on the evaluation of students focus on the problems of current evaluation policies. One of these problems is the lack of uniform standards. H. Jones (1963) discovered that procedures and criteria used in evaluating student work varied, as did the grades assigned. Similarly, Crowley (1968) found that grades lost their meaning because of a lack of clearly defined practices and procedures for grading. More specifically, Thomas (1965) concluded that there is little agreement on what roles are played by achievement and ability in arriving at the final grade. Along different lines, Fiber (1972) criticizes teachers for using a normal curve to assign grades, pointing out that this practice forces failure for some students in a class even if all have worked and learned something.

Several authors have discussed recent developments in the evaluation of students. Doherty (1975) draws the distinction between standards for individuals and standards for groups, as well as the distinction between normative and criterion-referenced standards. He argues that it is inappropriate to set standards for types of learning where cognitive development is a principal contributor to the type of capability being measured, if the intent of those standards is to try to get all students to achieve at a specified level. Instead, he maintains that it is appropriate to set standards for acquiring finite bodies of information or skills where their acquisition is judged necessary for a defined purpose. Job competence, personal competence, social competence, or entry to higher levels of education or training are examples of such purposes. Haynes (1973) deals with teacher accountability based on student outcomes, believing that such a system can have deleterious effects on study in the humanities. She maintains that the metaphoric perceptions of students, so important in the humanities, may be sacrificed for the more measurable and objective behavior required for accountability.

On a more positive note, Cohen (1973) found that among high school students the act of evaluating the work of peers was an

effective device for learning. This suggests that the benefits of collegial evaluation are not restricted to teachers and administrators.

Because schools transmit and modify the patterns of inequality in American society through the evaluation and categorization of students, this entire area is very important. Policies relating to student evaluation are seldom critically examined. The area deserves much more thought and attention than it has received.

Practice

People generally accept the premise that students should be frequently evaluated--they have been for years. Because of this, evaluation methods have been standardized. We will comment here only on proposals for nonstandard methods of evaluation.

Froe (1972) feels that the disadvantaged child should be given special consideration in the process of evaluation. He recommends short-range goals that are relevant to the life of the student and objectives oriented to the student's present goals. When the broad educational goal is to gain an understanding of democracy, for example, the study of the civil-rights movement may be more effective than the study of the colonial period for the minority child. The teacher must pay attention to the cultural basis of differences in student behavior (e.g., use of middle-class English) and be careful to evaluate only ability. Metzner (1971) cites several studies that illustrate teacher bias according to sex, socioeconomic status, race, reputation, and other nonacademic qualities of students.

The concept of accountability has permeated all types of school evaluation. Forehand et al. (1973) describe a program for student evaluation based on accountability. First, the school system establishes a minimum standard for student achievement. Then the students are tested to determine the base for their development. (The authors offer instructions for calculating this base point.) Teachers can then measure improvement based on the original scores. According to the authors, "The school staffs and the representatives of the school

system should be held accountable for the performance of their students regardless of the setting in which the school operates" (Forehand et al., 1973, p. 7). Teachers cannot use factors such as low socio-economic status as an excuse for meager student progress.

Bloom (1974) suggests that students should be consulted in the evaluation process. This suggestion ties the evaluation of students into the movement at all levels for participation of performers in the establishment of goals and criteria for evaluation of their performances.

Proposals for new methods of student evaluation are few and far between. Those mentioned above illustrate only some of the ways in which evaluation systems for students can be modified and improved.

In summary, the role of the student seems to carry different expectations for evaluation than the roles of administrator and teacher. Whereas teachers and administrators are more sheltered from evaluation, students appear to be particularly vulnerable to the effects of evaluation.

Although the frequency of evaluation appears to be greater, the theoretical literature offers support for features of evaluation that affect administrators and teachers also. Frequency of evaluation, knowledge of criteria or standards, and the need for quick and concise communication of evaluations remain important whether administrator, teacher, or student is the evaluatee. In policy-related articles, determining criteria seems to be the stumbling block in creating an evaluation system. As with teachers and administrators, evaluation for students has potential benefits that overshadow the meager attention given to such approaches in the literature. Practical suggestions for better student evaluation seem rare, despite the need for improvement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aleamoni, Lawrence M. Evaluation by Students to Identify General Instructional Problems. Urbana: Office of Instructional Resources, University of Illinois, 1973.

Alkin, Marvin C. "Accountability Defined." Evaluation Comment, May 1972.

Alkin, Marvin C., and Stephen P. Klein. "Evaluating Teachers for Outcome Accountability." Evaluation Comment, May 1972.

Alvir, Howard P. How to Hit a Moving Target (New Measurement Dimensions in Teacher Evaluation). April 1975. (ERIC No. ED 109 163)

American Association for Teacher Education. Performance-Based Teacher Education: An Annotated Bibliography. Washington, D.C., 1971.

Anderson, C. C., and S. M. Hunka. "Teacher Evaluation: Some Problems and a Proposal." Harvard Educational Review, Winter 1963.

Anderson, Dale G., et al. Guidance Evaluation Guidelines: Guidelines for Evaluation of Counseling and Guidance Programs. Olympia, Wa.: Washington State Board of Education, 1967.

Armstrong, Harold R. A Teacher's Guide to Teaching Performance Evaluation. Worthington, Ohio: School Management Institute, 1972.

Armstrong, Harold R. "Performance Evaluation." National Elementary Principal, February 1973.

Babin, Patrick. "Supervisors Look at Themselves." Instructional Development, November 1970.

Baltus, Dale F. "Accountable Evaluation for Improvement." Paper presented at Annual Convention of National Association of Elementary School Principals, Anaheim, Ca., April 1974.

Baral, Laurie R., comp. The Evaluation of Teachers: ERS Annotated Bibliography. Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, 1974.

Barraclough, Terry. "Administrator Evaluation" (Educational Management Review Series, No. 15). Eugene: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, April 1973.

Barry, H., and F. Fye. "Managerial Role: An Experiment in Training, Great Britain." Trends in Education, October 1970.

Beall, Lewis L. "Case Study No. 7: Evaluating the Principal." Thrust for Educational Leadership, November 1972.

Bejar, Isaac I. "A Survey of Selected Administrative Practices Supporting Student Evaluation of Instructional Programs." Research in Higher Education, 3 (1975), No. 1.

Beller, E. Kuno. "Teacher Evaluation: Why, What, and How." Peabody Journal of Education, January 1971.

Bhaermor, Robert D. "Accountability: How Can It Really Work for the Teacher?" School Progress, February 1971.

Bhaermor, Robert D. "Merit Pay? No." National Elementary Principal, February 1973.

Bidwell, Charles E. "The School as a Formal Organization." In James G. March, ed., Handbook of Organizations. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Bidwell, Jean S. "Focus on the Three A's: Accountability, Articulation, Achievement." Foreign Language Annals, May 1975.

Blair, Weston Leo. "An Exploratory Study of Faculty Perceptions of Teacher Evaluation Criteria." Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1974.

Block, James H. "Student Evaluation: Toward the Setting of Mastery Performance Standards." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1972.

Bloom, Thomas K. "Peer Evaluation--A Strategy for Student Involvement." Man/Society/Technology, February 1974.

Blount, Gail, comp. Teacher Evaluation: An Annotated Bibliography (Current Bibliography, No. 8). Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, March 1974.

Bobr, John E. "The Dilemma in Evaluating Instruction." National Elementary Principal, February 1973.

Bohlken, Robert, and Kim Griffin. "A Paradigm for Determining High School Teacher Effectiveness." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, December 1970.

Bowman, Jeff Ray. "Cognitive and Affective Dimensions within Teacher Evaluation." Doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, 1971.

Bradley, Ruth, et al. Measuring Teacher Competence: Research Backgrounds and Current Practice. Burlingame, Ca.: California Teachers Association, 1964.

Brodbelt, Samuel. "The Impact of Educational Accountability upon Teachers and Supervisors." High School Journal, November 1972.

Brooks, David W., and Hanna Levinson. "Questions and Answers to Questions." Journal of Chemical Education, March 1974.

Brown, William R. "Checklist for Assessment of Science Teachers and Its Use in a Science Preservice Teacher Education Project." Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 10 (1973), No. 3.

Bryld, Warren Frederick. "Evaluation and Authority in a Pre-Service Teacher Training Program." Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1973.

Buck, James, and James F. Parsley, comps. The Way We See It: A Survey of Teacher Evaluation Policies and Practices Operant in the State of Washington. Seattle: School Information and Research Service, March 1973.

Burkhart, Robert C., ed. The Assessment Revolution: New Viewpoints for Teacher Evaluation. Albany: Division of Teacher Education and Certification, New York State Education Department, 1969.

Burnett, K. R., and C. A. Edwards. "Principal's Role in Negotiations." Contemporary Education, May 1970.

Bush, Robert Emerson. "Methodology for the Development of Secondary School Teacher Evaluation Instruments." Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1973.

Bushell, Donald, Jr. "Evaluating Classroom Progress." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, February 1973.

Caldwell, Bruce G. "Differentiated Staffing and Collegial Evaluation." Educational Technology, June 1971.

California Bureau of Education Research. Evaluating Pupil Progress. Sacramento, Ca., 1960.

Cameron, William John. "Perceptions of Principals, Teachers, and School Board Members of Factors to Be Considered in a Teacher Evaluation Formula Based on Student Growth as Adjusted for Student Characteristics and Available Facilities and Materials." Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, 1973.

Campbell, Ronald F. "The Evaluation of Administrative Performance." Paper presented at Annual Convention of American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N. J., February 1971.

Carvell, James. "Case Study No. 6: Evaluating Administrative Performance." Thrust for Educational Leadership, November 1972.

Case, Chester H., and Steven A. Brown. Introducing SPT/VTR:P [Sequenced Peer Teaching/Video Tape Recording: Playback], 1970.

Castelter, William B., and Richard S. Heisler. Appraising and Improving the Performance of School Administrative Personnel. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University, Graduate School of Education, 1971.

Chan, Peter Vincent. "A Study of the Relationship between Principals' Philosophies and Teachers' Philosophies in Educational Practices and Teacher Evaluation." Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1973.

Clarke, Gerald E. "Merit Rating: Myth or Possibility?" National Elementary Principal, February 1973.

Coats, William D. "How to Evaluate Your Administrative Staff." Paper presented at Annual Convention of National School Boards Association, Houston, Texas, April 1974.

Coats, William D. "Accountability in Education--the Kalamazoo Plan." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Association of School Administrators, Dallas, Texas, February 1975.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Florence B. Brower. The Who, What, Why of Instructor Evaluation. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, UCLA, 1972.

Cohen, Arthur M., and Florence B. Brower. "Evaluating Faculty." Community Colleges, September 1972.

Cohen, Stuart J. "The Effect on One's Own Performance of Evaluating Peers." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, February 1973.

Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio. Teacher Evaluation to Improve Learning: The Fourth Report of the Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio. Cleveland, 1972.

Corbin, Gerald Sanford. "The Development of Behavioral Expectation Scales for Teacher Evaluation." Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1973.

Corwin, Ronald A. "Staff Conflict in the Public Schools." Unpublished paper, Ohio State University, Columbus, 1968.

Covert, James R. "Second Thoughts about Professionalism." Educational Forum, January 1975.

Crowley, Leon V. "An Investigation of the Marking Practices in Secondary Schools." Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1968.

Culbertson, Jack A. "Evaluation of Middle-Administrative Personnel: A Component of the Accountability Process." Paper presented at Annual Convention of American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City. N.J., February 1971.

Culbertson, Jack A., et al., eds. Performance Objectives for School Principals: Concepts and Instruments. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1974.

Davis, Barbara Irene. "The Status of Teacher Evaluation Practices in Arizona and a Proposed Model." Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1974.

Deneen, James R., et al. The Selection and Evaluation of Teachers' Presentations to the American Association of School Personnel Administrators. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1972.

DePree, Kenneth R. "Administrative Evaluation: Problems, Process, and Strategies." Paper presented at Annual Convention of American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City. N.J., February 1974.

De Prospo, Ernest R. "Personnel Evaluation as an Impetus to Growth." Library Trends, July 1971.

Detzner, Daniel F. "Teacher Evaluation: A Self-Appraisal Method." Unpublished paper, University of Minnesota, 1974.

DeVaughn, J. Everette. A Manual for Developing Reasonable, Objective, Non-discriminatory Standards for Evaluating Administrator Performance. State College: Educational Services Center, Mississippi State University, 1971a.

DeVaughn, J. Everette. Policies, Procedures, and Instruments in Evaluation of Teacher and Administrator Performance. Atlanta, Ga.: Davis Associates, 1971b.

DeVaughn, J. Everette. "Evaluation and Due Process: Legal Aspects." National Elementary Principal, February 1973.

Doherty, Victor W. "Appropriate and Inappropriate Uses of Performance Standards in School Evaluation." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April 1975.

Dornbusch, Sanford M., Terrence E. Deal, and Robert A. Crawford. "The Principal as an Evaluator of Teachers." Unpublished paper, Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, Stanford University, 1976.

Dornbusch, Sanford M., and W. R. Scott. Evaluation and the Exercise of Authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Downey, Ronald G. Associative Evaluations: Nominations vs. Ratings (Technical Paper No. 753). Arlington, Va.: Army Research Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences, 1974.

Dropkin, Stan. "Twin Dimensions of Teacher Behavior Assessment." Contemporary Education, January 1973.

Drumheller, Sidney J. "Evaluating Teachers through a Jaundiced Eye." Educational Technology, July 1974.

Dubuque Community School District. Summary of the Development and Four-Year Operation of an Administrative Salary System Which Includes Performance Appraisal. Dubuque, Iowa, 1973.

Duel, Henry James. "A Study of Validity and Reliability of Student Evaluation of Training." Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1956.

Dunlop, Richard S. "Counselor Competence: Some Proposals in Search of Advocacy." Facility: The Journal of the Professional Counselor's Association, September 1971.

Dyer, Francis M. "Selected Criteria for Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness." Improving College and University Teaching, Winter 1973.

Dyer, Henry S. "Toward Objective Criteria for Accountability." Evaluation and Measurement Newsletter, May 1971.

Dyer, Henry S. "School Evaluation: A Realistic Response to Accountability." North Central Association Quarterly, Spring 1972.

Eads, Albert Edward, Jr. "A Study of the Attitudes of Teachers toward a 'Supervision by Objectives' Teacher Evaluation Model." Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1974.

Earle, Jane. "Assessment and Accountability: The Compulsion to Know." Compact, May-June 1973.

Eckstein, Daniel G. "Improving Counselor Effectiveness by Means of Feedback and Encouragement." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Psychological Association, New Orleans, August 1974.

Educational Research Service. Evaluating Administrative/Supervisory Performance (Circular No. 6). Washington, D.C., 1971.

Elmore, Kenneth Claude. "Techniques Suggested for Teacher Evaluation, 1890-1973." Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1974.

English, F. and J. Zaharis. "Crisis in Middle Management." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, April 1972.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Administration. ERIC Abstracts: A Collection of ERIC Document Resumes on Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness (ERIC Abstract Series No. 20). Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators, April 1971. (ERIC No. ED 055 311)

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. ERIC Abstracts: A Collection of ERIC Document Resumes on Competency-Based Evaluation of Educational Staff. Eugene: University of Oregon, 1973.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Administrator Evaluation (The Best of ERIC Series, No. 1). Eugene: University of Oregon, 1974.

Esposito, James P. "A Procedure for Evaluating Supervisors." College Student Journal, November-December 1974.

Estes, N. "Concept of Shared Power." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, May 1971.

"Evaluating School Personnel: Symposium." National Elementary Principal, February 1973.

Evaluating Student Teaching. Washington, D.C.: Association for Student Teaching Yearbook, 1960.

Evans, N., and J. Shuttleworth. "Why a Principal Must Be a Supervisor." School Management, May 1974.

Eye, G. G. "Superintendent's Role in Teacher Evaluation, Retention, and Dismissal." Journal of Educational Research, July 1975.

Farquhar, R., and D. McCuaig. "Administration's Janus: The Two Faces of Educational Evaluation." Education Canada, Spring 1972.

Feldman, Sandra. Teacher Evaluation--A Teacher Unionist's View. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, November 1972.

Fernández, Celestino, Ruben W. Espinosa, and Sanford M. Dornbusch. Factors Perpetuating the Low Academic Status of Chicano High School Students (R&D Memorandum No. 138). Stanford, Ca.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1975. (ERIC No. ED 110 241)

Fererra, Robert James. "Perceptions of School Personnel and Board Members Regarding Teacher Evaluation Based on Performance Criteria." Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1974.

Ferris, Pat. "Some Ideas Concerning Evaluation of Counselors and Guidance Programs." Facility: The Journal of the Professional Counselor's Association, September 1971.

Fiber, Larry R. "The Pleasure of Failing Students." Journal of Business Education, January 1972.

Flanigan, George F. "The Stull Bill--Two Years Later." UCLA Educator, Spring 1974.

Flint, Robert F. "Evaluation: The Key to Better Police Service." Evaluation, Fall 1972.

"Florida Accountability Plan Focuses on the Principal." Nation's Schools, November 1970.

Foley, W. J. "Future of Administration and Educational Evaluation." Educational Technology, July 1970.

Forehand, Garlie A., et al. An Accountability Design for School Systems. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1973.

Fox, Norris Dudley. "The Status and Teacher-Administrator Perceptions of Selected Teacher Evaluation Practices." Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri at Columbia, 1971.

France, Norman. "Evaluation in the High School: Fact or Fiction?" Education Canada, March 1971.

Frazier, William H., and Gene A. Bedley. "Administrator Support System--A Strategy to Develop Performance Evaluation." Thrust for Educational Leadership, November 1972.

Frees, Ann M. "Case Study No. 3: Building an Evaluation Process at the Elementary School." Thrust for Educational Leadership, November 1972.

Freese, George Thomas. "A Study of Teacher Evaluation Practices in Illinois Public Secondary Schools." Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1973.

Friend, Ronald M., and Lorraine E. Wood. "Adults' Attribution of Responsibility for Success and Failure of Children from Different Social Backgrounds." Psychology in the Schools, July 1973.

Frison, L. S. "Evaluating Teacher Performance--How to Get Beyond the Checklist." Paper presented at Annual Convention of National Association of Secondary School Principals, Anaheim, Ca., March 1972.

Froe, Otis D. "Evaluating the Achievement of the Disadvantaged Student." Journal of Negro Education, Spring 1972.

Gale, Larrie, and Lloyd E. McCleary. Competencies of the Secondary School Principal: A Need Assessment Study, 1972. (ERIC No. ED 077 137)

Gaslin, W. L. "Evaluation of Administrative Performance by a School's Teaching Staff." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, December 1974.

Gibson, J. F. "Power vs. Authority: Fundamentals of Leadership." Clearing House, November 1975.

Goldbas, Mervyn, et al. Teacher Performance: Do We Know What We Are Evaluating? Fredonia, N.Y.: Teacher Education Research Center, SUNY, 1973.

Goldman, H. "Evaluation of Administrative Behavior at the Building Level." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, Spring 1970.

Grasha, Anthony F. Evaluating Teaching: Some Problems. Cincinnati, Ohio: Institute for Research and Training in Higher Education, University of Cincinnati, 1972.

Gray, Frank. "How Successful Is Performance Evaluation?" Paper presented at Annual Convention of American Association of School Administrators, Dallas, Texas, February 1975.

Greenberg, Barry, and Richard Mejias. "A Study of the Use of Multiple Regression with Dummy Variables to Identify Instructor Contribution to Student Achievement." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1972.

Gromisch, Donald S., et al. "A Comparison of Student and Departmental Chairman Evaluations of Teaching Performance." Journal of Medical Education, April 1972.

Guthrie, H. D., and D. J. Willover. "Ceremonial Congratulation: An Analysis of Principals' Observation Reports of Classroom Teaching." High School Journal, March 1973.

Hammons, Abe L. "How to Evaluate Teachers on Performance." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the National School Board Association, Miami Beach, Florida, April 1975.

Hannon, Ralph H., and Don J. Kralik. "Teacher Evaluation: A Business Approach." Journal of College Science Teaching, October 1973.

Harmon, Judson A., et al. "A Survey of Attitudes toward Policies and Procedures in the Evaluation of Instruction." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April 1975.

Harris, George W., Jr. "The Superintendent's Model for Administrator Evaluations at the Line and Staff Levels." Tennessee Education, Winter 1973.

Harsh, J. Richard. "A Look at Teacher Evaluation." Paper presented at Annual Conference of American Association of School Personnel Administrators, Las Vegas, Nevada, October 1970.

Harvey, Thomas R. "An Heretical Approach to Evaluation." Journal of Higher Education, November 1974.

Hasson, Allen. "A Comparison of Student Evaluation of Teaching and Teacher Self-Evaluation." Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1967.

Hawkins, Wilbur D. "Case Study No. 8B: Performance Evaluation, Starting with the Superintendent." Thrust for Educational Leadership, November 1972.

Hawthorne, Phyllis. Legislation by the States: Accountability and Assessment in Education. Denver: Colorado State Department of Education, 1973.

Haynes, Felicity. Accountability and Serendipity, 1973. (ERIC No. ED 107 584)

"Here Is How the Kalamazoo Board Contracts with Its Superintendent for Performance." American School Board Journal, February 1974 and March 1974.

Hillerich, Robert L. "Teacher Evaluation, Performance Contracting, and Accountability in Suburban Chicago Public Schools." Illinois School Research, Winter 1972.

Hind, Robert R. "University Faculty Authority Structure and the Evaluation Process." Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1968.

Hind, Robert R., Sanford M. Dornbusch, and W. Richard Scott. The Evaluation of University Teachers: An Application of a Theory of Evaluation and Authority (Technical Report No. 32). Stanford, Ca.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1972. (ERIC No. ED 071 618)

Hoak, Hazel. "Case Study No. 1: County or Regional Evaluation Program." Thrust for Educational Leadership, November 1972.

Hoffman, Robert E. "Student Evaluation and Principles of Learning." Journal of Business Education, May 1974.

Hoffner, James R. "Case Study No. 8A: Evaluation of Superintendent." Thrust for Educational Leadership, November 1972.

"How to Make Your Staff Accountable for What It Does--Not What It Is." American School Board Journal, March 1974.

Hoy, W. K., and L. B. Williams. "Loyalty to Immediate Superior at Alternate Levels in Public Schools." Educational Administration Quarterly, Spring 1971.

Hoyt, Donald P. "Identifying Effective Teaching Behavior." Unpublished paper, Kansas State University, 1969.

Hunter, Madeline C. "Appraising Teaching Performance: One Approach." National Elementary Principal, February 1973.

Hunter, Madeline C. "Piagetian Theory Applied to Assessment of the Teaching Process." California Journal of Teacher Education, October 1974.

Hyde Park Central School District. Teacher Appraisal Program, 1974-75. Hyde Park, New York, 1974.

Ingrahorn, William W., and John E. Keefe. "Values of Management by Objectives." School Management, June 1972.

Irvine, D. J. "Meeting the Demands for Accountability." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, November 1971.

Israel, Jack W. "Innovations in Evaluation: Teacher Assessment by Objectives." Unpublished paper, University of California at Los Angeles, March 1969.

Jacobson, Joan. "Should Students Evaluate Teachers?" Today's Education, May 1973.

Jaeger, Richard M., and Tom D. Freijo. "Some Psychometric Questions in the Evaluation of Professors." Journal of Educational Psychology, June 1974.

Jones, Anthony S. "A Realistic Approach to Teacher Evaluation." Clearing House, April 1972.

Jones, Hazel. "Teacher Understanding of Evaluation of Pupil Progress." Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1963.

Jones, Philip G. "How One School Board Judges, Rewards--and Penalizes--Its Superintendent on the Basis of His Performance." American School Board Journal, February 1974.

Kalamazoo Public Schools. Instructional Staff Performance Profiles and Related Information. Kalamazoo, Mich., 1974.

Kalmar, Albert. "The Other Side of the Coin." Independent School Bulletin, May 1974.

Keegan, John J., and Ralph Forsythe. "Accountability for Administrators: The Performance Objective." Catalyst for Change, Spring 1972.

King, Bob, and Wayne Jordan. Evaluation and Assessment of the Performance of Certificated Personnel. Fresno, Ca.: Fresno County Department of Education, 1972.

Koble, Daniel Elias, Jr. "A System for Teacher Evaluation to Promote Desirable Changes in Secondary Education Programs in Delaware Public Schools." Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1971.

Krasno, Richard M. "Accountability and Research on Teacher Effectiveness." Administrator's Notebook, September 1972.

Lahti, Robert E. "Improving Performance Appraisals." Community and Junior College Journal, March 1975.

Lamb, Joseph. "Gleanings from the Private Sector." Unpublished paper, New York Institute of Field Studies, Columbia University, 1972.

Laudicina, Robert, and Eleanor Laudicina. "Staff Evaluation and the Administrative Process." NASPA Journal, October 1972.

Lavelle, Norma C. "Evaluating Teacher Performance." Thrust for Educational Leadership, October 1972.

Lessinger, L. M. "Principal and Accountability." National Elementary Principal, October 1971.

Lill, George A. "A Study of Non-Tenure Elementary School Teacher Evaluation Programs in Selected New Jersey School Districts." Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1970.

Lindley, Jesse B. "The Development of a Teacher Evaluation Program." Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1962.

Los Angeles City Schools. Handbook for Evaluating Instruction. Los Angeles, Ca., 1971.

Lyons, Lamont S., et al. "A Systems Approach to Individualizing Instruction: The Staff Evaluation and Renewal Components." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 1974.

MacCallum, Keith. "Appraisal and Its Place in Management Development." Industrial Training International, March 1971.

McCarter, Ronald W. "Making the Most of Subjectivity in Faculty Evaluation: Truth Emerges from the Crossfire." American Vocational Journal, January 1974.

McCarty, D. J. "Evaluating Your Superintendent." School Management, July 1971.

McCauley, Brian L. "Evaluation and Authority in Radical Alternative Schools and Public Schools." Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1971.

McCauley, Brian L., Sanford M. Dornbusch, and W. Richard Scott. Evaluation and Authority in Alternative Schools and Public Schools (Technical Report No. 23). Stanford, Ca.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1972. (ERIC No. ED 064 787)

McFadden, Dennis N. Project D: Appraising Teaching Performance, Final Report; Increasing the Effectiveness of Educational Management. Columbus, Ohio: School Management Institute, 1970.

MacGregor, Douglas. "An Uneasy Look at Performance Appraisal." Harvard Business Review, May-June 1975.

McKenna, Bernard H. "A Context for Teacher Evaluation." National Elementary Principal, February 1973a.

McKenna, Bernard H. "Teacher Evaluation: Some Implications." Today's Education, February 1973b.

McNally, H. J. "Teacher Evaluation That Makes a Difference." Thrust for Educational Leadership, January 1972.

McNeil, John D. Supervision of Instruction: The Relationship of Theory and Practice to Accountability. Columbus: Ohio State Department of Education, 1972.

Marjoribanks, K. "Bureaucratic Structure in Schools and Its Relationship to Dogmatic Leadership." Journal of Educational Research, April 1970.

Marram, Gwen D., Sanford M. Dornbusch, and W. Richard Scott. The Impact of Teaming and the Visibility of Teaching on the Professionalism of Elementary School Teachers (Technical Report No. 33). Stanford, Ca.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1972. (ERIC No. ED 072 040)

Massey, Grace Carroll, Mona V. Scott, and Sanford M. Dornbusch. "Racism without Racists: Institutional Racism in Urban Schools." Black Scholar, November 1975.

Meade, Richard A. "Accountability for What?" English Education, Spring 1973.

Medley, Donald, et al. Assessment and Research in Teacher Education: Focus on PBTE (PBTE Monograph Series No. 17). Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1975.

Melton, G. E., and J. Stanavage. "Job Specifications for Principals." Education Digest, October 1970.

Metzner, S. "Teacher Bias in Pupil Evaluation: A Critical Analysis." Journal of Teacher Education, Spring 1971.

Miller, Duane Dean. "The Development of a Process Model to Utilize Peer Opinion for Teacher Evaluation in Selected Public Schools of Nebraska." Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1974.

Minnesota State Department of Personnel. Employee Appraisal System: A Supervisor's Manual. Saint Paul, 1974.

Monson, Diane L. "Evaluation: Quantity and Quality." Elementary English, May 1971.

Morin, Lloyd H. "A Feasible Scheme for Evaluation of Instructors." Paper presented at University of California at Los Angeles. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, August 1969.

Morsh, Joseph E., and Eleanor W. Wilder. Identifying the Effective Instructor: A Review of the Quantitative Studies, 1900-1952. Chanute AFB, Ill.: Air Force Personnel and Training Research Center, 1954. Report No. AFPTRC-TR-55-44.

Mueller, Dorothy G. "How to Evaluate Teaching." Journal of Teacher Education, Summer 1971.

Murray, Robert Ellis. "Evaluation: The Educational Phenomenon." Man/Society/Technology, February 1974.

Napa College. Evaluation of Administrators and Practices for Evaluating Administrators: Guidelines and Procedures for Evaluating Regular Tenured Administrators. Napa, Ca., 1973.

Nash, Paul. A Humanistic Approach to Performance-Based Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1973.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. Accountability: A Bibliography. Washington, D.C., 1974.

National Center for Educational Communication, DHEW. Teacher Evaluation, PREP-21. Washington, D.C., 1971.

National Education Association. Planning the Evaluation of Educators: A Simulation. Washington, D.C., 1972.

National Education Association, Division of Instruction and Professional Development. Accountability. Washington, D.C., 1972.

National Education Association, Division of Instruction and Professional Development. Accountability and the Teacher. Washington, D.C., 1973a.

National Education Association, Division of Instruction and Professional Development. Accountability in Education: An Annotated Bibliography. Washington, D.C., 1973b.

National Education Association, Division of Instruction and Professional Development. Evaluation Systems for Education: Descriptive Abstracts. Washington, D. C., 1973c.

National Education Association, Research Division. "Should Teachers Evaluate Principals? Should Principals Have Teaching Experience? Teacher Opinion Poll." Today's Education, April 1971.

National School Public Relations Association. "Evaluating Teachers for Professional Growth." Arlington, Va.: NSPRA, 1974.

"NJEA Speaks Out on . . . Teacher Evaluation." New Jersey Education Association Review, January 1971.

Nevo, David. "Evaluation Priorities of Students, Teachers, and Principals." Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1974.

Newlin, Bruce C. "Case Study No. 2: Implementation of Teacher Evaluation." Thrust for Educational Leadership, November 1972.

Nicholson, Everett W. "The Performance of Principals in the Accountability Syndrome." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, May 1972.

Nieburg, Warren Emmons. "Perceptions of Secondary Teachers and Evaluating Administrators Regarding Performance Factors in Teacher Evaluation." Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 1970.

The 1973 Boston Conference on Grading Alternatives. Amherst, Mass.: Values Associates, 1973.

Nobles, Howard Arthur. "Self, Student, and Principal Evaluation of Teachers Holding Master's Degrees and Bachelor's Degrees." Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1974.

Nolte, M. C. "Double-Loaded Power Squeeze Is Crunching Your Principals." American School Board Journal, August 1974.

Nuspel, John J. "In the Future: Objective or Subjective Evaluation of Teachers?" Education Tomorrow, December 1971.

Nygaard, Debra D. Evaluating Administrative Performance. Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, 1974.

O'Donnell, Holly Smith. "Accountable for What? ERIC/RCS Report." Elementary English, May 1974.

Ohio Association of Elementary School Principals. Evaluation of Administrators: Guidelines and Procedures. Westerville, Ohio, 1971.

Ohio Education Association. Teacher Evaluation: Interface on Learning. Columbus, 1970.

Olds, Robert. Self-Evaluation for Teachers and Administrators. Worthington, Ohio: School Management Institute, 1973.

Olds, Robert. "Performance Evaluation Rates a Close Look." Compact, May-June 1974.

Orlosky, Donald E. "Teacher Competence: To Do What?" Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, February 1973.

Orpaz, Nathan. "Self-Evaluation versus Teacher Evaluation in Junior High School Science." Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1974.

Ovard, Glen F. "The Practitioner's Guide to Research Teacher Effectiveness and Accountability." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, January 1975.

Palazzolo, Dominic Anthony. "The Points of View with Which Selected Suburban and Urban Elementary School Principals Perceive the Process of Principal Evaluation." Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1975.

Payne, John David. "A Study of the Relationship of Role Consensus and Principal Evaluation of the Teacher." Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri at Columbia, 1974.

Pedersen, K. G. "Improving Teacher Effectiveness." Education Canada, Fall 1975.

Peebles, James M. "Formal Procedures for Evaluating Principals." Paper presented at Annual Convention of National Association of Secondary School Principals, Dallas, Texas, February 1973.

Penn-Harris-Madison School Corporation. Performance-Based Teacher Appraisal Program for the Penn-Harris-Madison School Corporation. Mishawaka, Indiana, 1973.

Percival, Robert R. "A Competency-Measurement Instrument for Evaluating School Counselors." Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, May 1974.

Pettman, Philip J. Student Evaluation of Faculty, 1965-1970: An Annotated Bibliography. Minneapolis: University Measurement Services, University of Minnesota, 1970.

Fharis, William. "The Evaluation of School Principals." National Elementary Principal, February 1973.

Poliakoff, Lorraine. "Recent Trends in Evaluating School Personnel." National Elementary Principal, February 1973.

Poore, Ernest A. "Evaluation and Assessment of the Performance of Certified Personnel." Thrust for Educational Leadership, November 1972.

Popham, James W. Designing Teacher Evaluation Systems. Los Angeles: Instructional Objectives Exchange, 1971.

Popham, James W. "Found: A Practical Procedure to Appraise Teacher Achievement in the Classroom." Nation's Schools, May 1972a.

Popham, James W. "The New World of Accountability: In the Classroom." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, May 1972b.

Popham, James W. "Pitfalls and Pratfalls of Teacher Evaluation." Thrust for Educational Leadership, Spring 1975.

"Principal as a Professional and His Role in Change: Symposium." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, October 1971.

Raisch, C. Daniel. "Competency-Based Teacher Evaluation: A Study and Model." Doctoral dissertation, Miami University, 1973.

Ray, Andrew. "Teacher Accountability, or What?" Social Science Record, Winter 1974.

"Ready? Let's Open That Can of Worms and Rate Teachers on How They Perform." American School Board Journal, April 1974.

Redfern, George B. How to Evaluate Teaching: A Performance Objectives Approach. Worthington, Ohio: School Management Institute, 1972a.

Redfern, George B. "Principals: Who's Evaluating Them, Why, and How?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, May 1972b.

Resnick, Norman H., and Henry R. Reinert. "Competency-Based Teacher Education." Colorado Journal of Educational Research, February 1973.

Rice, Marion Fay. "Teacher Evaluation: A Function of Perceived Psychological Freedom." Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1973.

Richardson, R. C., Jr. "Can Faculty Evaluation Improve Instruction?" Community and Junior College Journal, November 1973.

Richter, S., and C. Zion. "Selecting the Right Criteria for Evaluation." Community and Junior College Journal, November 1973.

Rooney, Patrick O. Evaluation System for School Administrators. Ventura, Ca.: Ventura Unified School District, 1973.

Roper, Susan S., T. E. Deal, and S. M. Dornbusch. "Collegial Evaluation of Classroom Teaching: Does It Work?" Educational Research Quarterly, Spring 1976. Also published as A Pilot Test of Collegial Evaluation for Teachers (R&D Memorandum No. 142). Stanford, Ca.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1976.

Rosenberg, M. "How to Evaluate Your Principals." American School Board Journal, June 1973.

Roth, Robert A., and Peggy Mahoney. "Teacher Competencies and Assessment Techniques." Paper presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., 1975.

Ryans, David G. Teacher Evaluation Research, Part I: Consideration of Critical Issues, Feasibility of Collaborative Research, and Overall Design. Final Report. Honolulu: Education Research and Development Center, University of Hawaii, 1971.

Sarthory, Joseph A. Professional Improvement and Staff Evaluation: An Information Paper on KSA 72-9001 to 72-9006, Evaluation of Certified School Employees. Topeka: Kansas State Department of Education, 1973.

Sawyer, Thomas M. "Accountability: Or Let Others Grade Your Students." Paper presented at the Conference on College Composition and Communication, St. Louis, March 1975.

Schafer, Michael I., comp. Faculty Evaluation Working Papers: 1970-71, Revision. Florida Community Junior College, 1971.

Schools Council. Teachers' Experience of School Based Examining (Examinations Bulletin No. 15). London, England, 1967.

Schools Council. Schemes of Assessment: Experimental Examinations for a Common System of Examining. London, England, 1974.

Schulman, Benson R., and James W. Trudell. "California's Guidelines for Teacher Evaluation." Community and Junior College Journal, October 1972.

Scott, Harry V. "Classroom Assignments: A Constructive Approach to an Ignored Teaching Competency." Kappa Delta Pi Record, February 1972.

Semb, George. "Research Strategies in Higher Education." Unpublished paper, Department of Human Development, University of Kansas, 1973.

Shannon, Thomas A. "Evaluation of School Personnel." Speech given before Annual School Law Conference of Kansas Association of School Boards, Topeka, Kansas, May 1972.

Shapiro, Edna. "Educational Evaluation: Rethinking the Criteria of Competence." School Review, August 1973.

Shaw, Jane S. "Students Evaluate Teachers and--Better Sit Down--It Works." Nation's Schools, April 1973.

Shearron, Gilbert F., and Charles E. Johnson. "A CBTE Program in Action: University of Georgia." Journal of Teacher Education, February 1973.

Shugrue, Michael P. Performance-Based Teacher Education and the Subject-Matter Fields. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1973.

Simpson, Roy H., and Jerome M. Seidman. Student Evaluation of Teaching and Learning. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1962.

Sinha, Pradhan Beinlanand. "A Teacher Evaluation Instrument for Secondary Schools in India." Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1962.

Slezak, James M., and Sidney E. Hollins. "Case Study No. 5: Hidden Valley Professional Staff Improvement System." Thrust for Educational Leadership, November 1972.

Slusher, E. Allen. "A Systems Look at Performance Appraisal." Personnel Journal, February 1975.

Smith, Bruce Evans. "Research Design in Studies of Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness in Higher Education." Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1971.

Soper, John C. "Soft Research on a Hard Subject: Student Evaluations Reconsidered." Journal of Economic Education, February 1973.

Sorenson, Garth. "A New Role in Education: The Evaluator." Evaluation Comment, January 1968.

Southworth, W. D. "Elementary School Principalship, 1980." Clearing House, November 1971.

Spears, Roy, Jr. "Guidelines for Developing a Program of Teacher Evaluation." Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1974.

Speicher, Don. "Can Teacher Evaluation Be Made Meaningful?" Paper presented at Annual Convention of American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N.J., February 1972.

Starr, Fay Haven. "Antecedents and Concomitants of Change in Teacher Evaluation of Pupil Performance." Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1964.

Stemnock, Suzanne K. "The Evaluatee Evaluates the Evaluator." Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, 1970.

Stemnock, Suzanne K. "Evaluating the Superintendent of Schools" (ERS Circular No. 6). Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, 1972a.

Stemnock, Suzanne K. "Evaluating Teaching Performance" (ERS Circular No. 2). Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, 1972b.

Stemnock, Suzanne K. "Evaluating the Evaluator" (ERS Circular No. 4). Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, 1973.

Stewart, B. C. "Some Criteria for the Evaluation of Guidance Counsellors." School Guidance Worker, September-October 1974.

Stier, Lealand D. "A Comparison of Self-Evaluation, Peer Evaluation, Teacher Evaluation, and Standardized Tests on Personality and Achievement Factors in the Fifth Grade and Eighth Grade." Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1949.

Stinson, Joe Robert. "A Study of Teacher Evaluation as Recognized by Selected Teachers and Principals." Doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1971.

Stones, E., and S. Morris. "The Assessment of Practical Teaching." Educational Research, February 1972.

Sullivan, R. E. "Art of Making Teacher Evaluations." The Instructor, May 1972.

Swanson, Ronald G. "The Teacher as Leader." College Student Journal, November-December 1974a.

Swanson, Ronald G. "Teacher Evaluation as a Function of Leadership Style: A Multiple Correlational Approach." Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1974b.

Taneman, Ira Leonard. "A Teaching Power Test: A Method of Using Pupil Gain as a Criterion in Teacher Evaluation." Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1970.

Taylor, D. Dax, and J. Christopher Reid. "Criterion-Referenced Evaluation of Student Performance." Journal of Medical Education, December 1972.

Thayer, Arthur N. "Performance Evaluation." Thrust for Educational Leadership, November 1972.

Thistle, Everett G. "An Investigation of Plans for Teacher Evaluation." Doctoral dissertation, Boston University School of Education, 1955.

Thomas, E. Barrington. "Criteria Employed by High School Principals in Evaluating Teachers." Journal of Educational Administration, May 1972.

Thomas, William C. "Policies and Procedures Relating to Pupil Marking in the Public High Schools of California." Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1965.

Thompson, June E. "Evaluation and Authority in Elementary and Secondary Schools: A Comparison of Teachers and Administrators." Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1971.

Thompson, June E., Sanford M. Dornbusch, and W. Richard Scott. Failures of Communication in the Evaluation of Teachers by Principals (Technical Report No. 43). Stanford, Ca.: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, 1975.

Thomson, J. "A Note on the Evaluation of Teaching Performance." Journal of Educational Administration, May 1971.

Thornsley, Jerome R. "Case Study No. 4: Recognition and Respect for Teacher Competency." Thrust for Educational Leadership, November 1972.

Todd, Donald F., and Patrick M. Manning. "Job Evaluation Goes to School." Personnel Journal, July-August 1974.

Toker, John Frederick. "A Study of a Teacher Evaluation Instrument Used for the Improvement of Instruction in the Public Schools of Hastings, Nebraska." Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1965.

Toug, M. S., and J. F. Feldhusen. "Validity of Student Ratings of Instructors." College Student Journal, November-December 1974.

Travis, Earl James. "A Study of the Relationships between Teacher Perception of the Principal's Role and Teacher Evaluation of the Principal." Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri at Columbia, 1972.

Turner, Lloyd D. "Your Superintendent: When to Recharge Him--Or Discharge Him." American School Board Journal, July 1971.

Turner, Lynn. "Administrator Evaluation." Catalyst for Change, Spring 1974.

Tyler, R. W., ed. Educational Evaluation: New Roles, New Means: The Sixty-Eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

University of Houston, College of Education. Faculty Evaluation: A Rationale and a Plan. Houston, Texas, 1972.

Vandervert, Larry R. "Student Evaluation of Instruction: Some Theoretical Considerations and a Proposal." Paper presented at the Meeting of the Washington State Community College District 17 Board of Trustees, March 1974.

Veterans Administration. Common Sense about Evaluating and Recognizing Performance. Washington, D.C., 1966.

Voege, Richard B. Procedures for Evaluating Classroom Teachers in Central School Districts in the State of Washington. Seattle: School Information and Research Service, 1970.

Walker, Robert A. "The Ninth Panacea: Program Evaluation." Evaluation Comment, Fall 1972.

Washington, Eva. Expert Teacher Action Program. Belmont, Ca.: Fearon Publishers, 1971.

Wear, Maurice, and Myron Basom. "Accountability in Education." Unpublished paper, Educational Administration Workshop, University of Wyoming, College of Education, July 1970.

Wedel, Mack Robert. "A Critical Analysis of a Teacher Evaluation Program." Doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1964.

Weinrauch, J. Donald, and J. Kenneth Matejka. "Are Student Ratings of Business Communication Teachers Honest Feedback?" Journal of Business Communication, February 1973.

Westside Community Schools. Job Improvement by Objectives. Omaha, Nebraska, 1971.

"What Is the Role of the Principal? Teacher Opinion Poll." The Instructor, March 1971.

Williams, James Templeton. "The Performance of the Elementary Principal in Relationship to Teacher Evaluation, Community Socio-Economic Status, and Selected Professional Training." Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1970.

Williams, Stanley H. "The Teacher-Evaluation Practices of Secondary School Principals in Arkansas." Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1972.

Wilson, Alfred P., and Vivian E. Smith. "The Public School Principal's Function in Evaluation as Defined by an Analysis of Periodicals and Books." Unpublished paper, Kansas State University, 1974.

Wilson, Lavel S. "How to Evaluate Teacher Performance." Paper presented at Annual Convention of National School Boards Association, Miami Beach, Florida, April 1975.

Wolf, R. L. "Making Education Accountable to the Learner: A Framework for Evaluation." Journal of Research and Development in Education, Fall 1971.

Wolff, Florence I. "Teachers' Potpourri: A Survey of Evaluative Criteria for Faculty Promotion in College and Speech Departments." Speech Teacher, November 1971.

Zelenak, Melchior James. "Teacher Perceptions of the Teacher Evaluation Process." Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1973.